

Serial No. 10/529,405  
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P00251WOUS

### REMARKS

Claims 17-20, 24-27, 30-32, and 34-36 have been amended. Claims 23 and 29 have been canceled. No claims have been added by way of this response. Thus, claims 17-22, 24-28, and 30-36 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### Response to Objections:

Claims 18-20, 23, 27, 29, 31, 32 and 34-36 have been objected to by the Examiner. Applicant has corrected the informalities and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

#### Response to Provisional Double Patenting Rejection:

Claims 17, 26 and 30 stand provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as "claiming the same invention as that of claim 23 and 27 of co-pending application No 10/884,485".

Claims 17 and 26 of the instant application recites:

storing a domain name in the device ...; transmitting a request message comprising the stored domain name to an addressing server by the device

Claim 30 of the instant application recites:

an addressing server for converting between domain names and Internet protocol addresses ...

Claim 23 of the co-pending application recites:

storing an address of an address assignment server in the device; transmitting an inquiry message to the address assignment server from the device

Claim 27 of the co-pending application recites:

an address assignment server;

Serial No. 10/529,405  
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P00251WOUS

Thus, Claims 17, 26 and 30 of the instant application do not claim the same invention as that of claim 23 and 27 of co-pending application because the claims do not recite the same invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Provisional Double Patenting rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 17, 19-30 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Reichmeyer et al. (USPN 6,286,038) in view of Choudhry (USPN 6,442,602). Claims 18 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Reichmeyer in view of Choudhry and Skemer et al. (USPN 6,570,849)

Applicant's Claim 17 recites:

storing a domain name in the device ... transmitting a request message comprising the stored domain name to an addressing server by the device... receiving a response message from the addressing server by the device, the response message comprising address information of a parameter server associated with the device; setting up a connection to the parameter server by the device, the device using the address information to set up the connection; and receiving parameters by the device from the parameter server, wherein the parameters are used to configure the device.

In contrast, as the Examiner points out, Reichmeyer teaches "the device automatically get[sic] the network IP address associated with the network device so the DHCP server does not need to convert between the domain name an IP addresses." An IP address associated with the device cannot reasonably considered as an address information of a parameter server. Furthermore, the IP address of the device cannot be used to set up a connection parameter server. Moreover, the Examiner points out the Reichmeyer teaches storing the IP address on the device as a result of DHCP request. An IP address learned as a result of a request cannot reasonably be considered a domain name used in the request message.

The following is a quotation from MPEP 2143

Serial No. 10/529,405

Atty. Doc. No. 2003P00251WOUS

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

In view of the above, claim 17 is not obvious over Reichmeyer in view of Choudhry. Furthermore, Claims 18-22, and 24-25 which depend on claim 17 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 17 as well as based on their own merits. For at least the reasons discussed for claim 17, independent claims 26 and 30 are also patentable. As well as their dependent claims 27, 28 and 31-36. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

Serial No. 10/529,405

Atty. Doc. No. 2003P00251WOUS

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/26/07By: 

John P. Musone  
Registration No. 44,961  
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830